

Chapter 5

KEY ISSUE ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The U.S. Review Team's research relied upon textual material found in the National Archives, press reports, official histories, and Korean and American witness statements, and other sources. By comparing and contrasting all of these available information sources, the U.S. Review Team developed a clearer picture of the events that occurred in the vicinity of No Gun Ri in July 1950. These findings represent the conclusions the U.S. Review Team could derive based on the availability or absence of 50-year-old evidence and memory.

This report uses the terms "civilians" and "refugees". For the purpose of this report, refugee is defined as a person who is fleeing to a place of safety; implied within that definition is that a refugee is an innocent person. During the Korean War, NKPA soldiers infiltrated refugee columns, and civilian collaborators or persons assisting the NKPA were also in refugee parties. The NKPA collaborators and soldiers dressed in civilian clothing so that they could pass as refugees and blend in with refugees traveling through the U.S. forces' lines. Therefore, the term civilian is used if it could not be determined that civilians being described were "refugees" as defined above. If the sentence or paragraph is a quotation, reference to a witness statement, or document that used the word refugee, the word refugee is used.

For reference, an organizational chart of the 1st Cavalry Division is included in Appendix E. The major subordinate units of the 1st Cavalry Division were the 5th Cavalry Regiment, the 7th Cavalry Regiment, and the 8th Cavalry Regiment.

I. Key Issue 1: Condition of U.S. Forces in July 1950

U.S. soldiers were young, under-trained, under-equipped, and unprepared for the tactics used by the North Korean People's Army (NKPA). The soldiers of the Army of Occupation in Japan functioned primarily as a constabulary in a conquered land and not as combat-ready war fighters. Their training was hampered by the lack of adequate equipment and proper training areas. While company and battalion training had been completed in the 1st Cavalry Division within a year of the war's outbreak, regimental training, which involves more complex maneuver and coordination, had not been conducted.¹ Classes for critical specialties such as maintenance and communications were also inadequate. They simply did not have all the means necessary to prepare for war. Complicating the problem of training was a lack of combat experience; most of the leaders at company and below had none. The condition of U.S. forces in July 1950 is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2.

Compounding the 1st Cavalry Division's personnel problems was the requirement to bring the 24th Infantry Division up to strength prior to that division's

earlier departure for Korea. The 1st Cavalry Division transferred nearly 800 men, most of them from the top four senior non-commissioned officer grades, to the 24th.² This loss of noncommissioned officers with whom the soldiers had trained weakened the cohesion of the division and further reduced the number of leaders with combat experience at the small-unit level. The Army made every effort to correct these shortfalls through promotion and reorganization, but no unit can effectively perform its mission with so many critical non-commissioned officers missing.

The authorized peacetime manning levels for 1950 meant that the three infantry regiments in each division had only two of the three battalions normally assigned. Likewise, each regiment lacked its authorized tank company. The division artillery battalions were also reduced from three to two firing batteries. In addition, the 1st Cavalry Division's equipment was largely of World War II vintage. The under-strength regiments, loss of noncommissioned officers, and World War II equipment significantly weakened the combat power of the 1st Cavalry Division when it deployed to Korea.

The lack of training also left soldiers unprepared for the North Korean tactics they encountered. Unlike the expectations expressed by one veteran who thought they were going to fight guerillas, the NKPA was well trained and nearly a third had combat experience in the Chinese Communist Forces during the Chinese civil war. The North Koreans were well supplied with tanks and artillery and used their equipment skillfully in massed, combined-arms attacks. The NKPA also used envelopment tactics that were unfamiliar to the U.S. soldier coming from Japan.³

Documentary evidence also reflects U.S. concern with the particularly troublesome and constant infiltration techniques of North Korean soldiers who routinely slipped through American lines disguised as civilians and then attacked the American positions from the rear. From the earliest days of the war, U.S. soldiers routinely captured infiltrating NKPA soldiers wearing peasant clothing over their uniforms.⁴

During U.S. Review Team interviews, Army veterans indicated that they were warned of incidents in which North Korean soldiers wore civilian clothes, intermingled with civilians to infiltrate U.S. lines, and ambushed U.S. forces from the rear. Likewise, the soldiers received instructions to be wary of groups of individuals dressed in civilian clothes. Sixteen of the 17 USAF veterans interviewed believed that NKPA soldiers were infiltrating civilian refugee groups. At least five USAF veterans testified to having visually confirmed that this infiltration was taking place.

Finding: Based on the documentary evidence, as well as the statements by U.S. veterans, the U.S. Review Team concluded that most American units and soldiers were not adequately prepared for the combat conditions that they

confronted in Korea in June and July 1950. No experience or training equipped them to deal with an aggressive enemy that employed both conventional and guerilla warfare tactics or with a large refugee population, which the enemy was known to have infiltrated. Shortages of experienced noncommissioned officers, along with inadequate equipment and doctrine, made it difficult for individuals or units to adapt to these conditions.

II. Key Issue 2: U.S. and ROK Refugee Control Policies

The U.S. troops were completely unprepared for the stark reality of dealing with the numerous, uncontrolled refugees who clogged the roads and complicated the battlefield to an unexpected degree. U.S. forces also encountered the NKPA practice of using civilian dress as a cover for infiltration early in the war. U.S. and ROK refugees control policies are outlined below and are discussed more extensively in Chapter 2.

In late July 1950, the ROK government and the Eighth U.S. Army headquarters issued refugee control policies to protect the U.S. and ROK forces from NKPA infiltration and attacks from the rear. Additionally, these policies were aimed at reducing the adverse impact of refugees on military operations. This adverse impact included the crowding of main supply routes, which stymied the U.S. and UN troops' ability to rush ammunition forward and evacuate casualties to the rear. These U.S. and ROK refugee policies depended heavily upon the constant presence of, and coordination with, the ROK National Police to handle the uncontrolled refugee population.

Despite comments attributed to Major General Gay, the 1st Cavalry Division Commander, that he would not employ the Korean National Police in his division's area of operations, the official records, including his refugee policy directive of July 23, 1950, made the National Police responsible for handling refugees.

The first policy document to address controlling of refugee movement, titled "Control of Refugee Movement", was issued by Headquarters, 1st Cavalry Division (Infantry), on July 23, 1950. The movement of civilians and refugees in the 1st Cavalry Division area was permitted from 10:00 AM to 12:00 noon only; no ox carts, trucks, or civilian cars were allowed to operate on highways; no fields could be worked; no school, shops, or industries could be operated unless they were essential to the war effort; and municipal authorities, local police, and National Police were to enforce this directive. The policy makes no mention of the use of force by soldiers. The National Police would collect all refugees from the countryside and highways, and carry them by rail or trucks to screening points. Division Counter-Intelligence Corps (CIC) personnel would screen the refugees at established roadblocks and checkpoints. Units within the 1st Cavalry Division had instructions to turn over refugees to CIC or G-2 (Intelligence) Interrogation for screening.⁵

On July 25, 1950, a conference took place at the Capitol Building in Taegu. Participants from the Republic of Korea Government, American Embassy, National Police, United Nations, and the Eighth U.S. Army Korea (EUSAK) agreed upon a plan to control refugee movement.⁶ As a result of this meeting, EUSAK issued a four-part, detailed message on July 26, 1950:

Part I: Effective immediately the following procedure will be adhered to by all commands relative to the flow or movement of all refugees in battle areas and rear areas. No refugees will be permitted to cross battle lines at any time. Movement of all Koreans in groups will cease immediately. No areas will be evacuated by Koreans without a direct order from Commanding General EUSAK or upon order of Division Commanders. Each division will be assigned three National Police liaison officers to assist in clearing any area of the civilian populace that will interfere with the successful accomplishment of his mission.

Part II: Procedure for clearing areas. Division commanders will inform National Police Officers of the area or sector to be evacuated, the route, and the time the area will be cleared. National Police will immediately clear the area. Food, water, and comfort items for these refugees will be provided by the Vice Minister of Social Affairs through the National Police. All refugees will move along their predetermined route to selected concentration areas from sunup until sundown. This will be a controlled movement under the direction and supervision of the National Police and representatives from the office of Korean Welfare Affairs.

Part III: Movement of Korean civilians during hours of darkness. There will be absolutely no movement of Korean civilians, as individuals or groups, in battle areas or rear areas, after the hours of darkness. Uniformed Korean police will rigidly enforce this directive.

Part IV: To accomplish the procedure, as outlined in this directive, leaflets will be prepared and dropped in all areas forward and rear of the battle line to effectively disseminate this information. National Police will further disseminate this information to all Korean civilians by means of radio, messenger, and the press.⁷

The NKPA frequently used civilian clothing and refugees to conceal their movements. The Eighth Army's policy was intended to deny the NKPA that tactic while also safeguarding civilians by prohibiting refugees from crossing battle lines (Battle lines are the areas where there is contact with the enemy or contact is about to occur).

The policy did not state that refugees could not cross friendly lines and contains instructions for the handling of refugees in friendly areas (friendly lines are forward troop positions not in contact with the enemy). The policy empha-

sized the Korean government's responsibility for the control and screening of refugees to provide for their welfare. Nothing in this policy was intended to put refugees at risk.

On July 27, 1950, Lieutenant General Walker's Headquarters EUSAK (Eighth U.S. Army, Korea) G-2 (Intelligence Staff Section) issued Intelligence Instruction No. 4 describing actions Counter-Intelligence Corps (CIC) teams must take relative to the movement and interrogation of refugees. These instructions included maintaining daily contact with the South Korean Army and local Korean law enforcement agencies; conducting surveillance and inspections of police and South Korean Army refugee checkpoints; screening, checking, and interrogating detainees deemed to be of counter intelligence value; and checking and reporting on curfew regulations and enforcement.⁸

Leaflets also provided a method of conveying the theater policy on refugee movement to civilians in or near the combat zone. An order issued sometime in 1950 for these leaflets from the Far East Command's Psychological Warfare Branch stipulated that the leaflets would say that civilians are forbidden to move through the battle lines, that the civilian residents of some areas may be evacuated under the supervision of the Minister of Social Affairs and the National Police, and that refugees will move only by daylight. The leaflets also had to state that the National Police would rigidly enforce these orders to protect the ROK and UN forces.⁹

The UN forces and the Eighth Army relied heavily upon the ROK National Police's assistance in controlling the refugee problem and executing the joint Eighth Army and ROK refugee policy. An example of the ROK National Police's indispensable help appears in a monograph written by Lieutenant Colonel J.P. Powhida entitled "Civilian Control in South Korea."¹⁰ As a member of the 1st Cavalry Division's G-3 (Operations) section and liaison officer to two of the infantry regiments in mid-July 1950, Lieutenant Colonel Powhida described how he arrived in Yongdong on or about July 21 and directed the Korean police chief to use his 90-man police force to move the teeming refugee columns down trails and off of the highways. The police then directed the refugees to Kumchon for screening and subsequent evacuation. Even though Lieutenant Colonel Powhida rated the effectiveness of this hasty operation at 50 percent, the presence of the ROK National police certainly brought greater order to the chaos and helped the ground forces keep the lines of communication open.

Most veterans from the 7th Cavalry Regiment interviewed by the U.S. Review Team were enlisted men during the Korean War. They did not receive copies of policies from higher headquarters. In general, the U.S. veterans' recollection of refugee control policies was they should be careful with refugees. These soldiers received instructions and orders from their sergeants and platoon leaders. Many U.S. veterans remember receiving warnings that there were North Korean infiltrators among the refugees. A few soldiers do not remember hearing

that there were infiltrators among the refugees. The veterans who remembered more specific details about refugee control remembered specific actions to be taken; for example, keep refugees off the roads, do not let refugees pass, or search refugees and let them pass. One veteran, when asked about refugees, said they were supposed get them off the road, keep them off the road, and send them south.

The policy not to let refugees cross battle lines was designed to protect U.S. forces in light of the infiltration tactics used by the North Koreans and the congestion on the roads.

Finding: From its study of the refugee control policies in effect during the last week of July 1950, the U.S. Review Team found that the Eighth U.S. Army published, in coordination with the ROK government, refugee control policies that reflected two predominant concerns: (1) protecting U.S. and ROK troops from the danger of NKPA soldiers infiltrating U.S. - ROK lines, and (2) precluding uncontrolled refugee movements from impeding flows of supplies and troops. The published 1st Cavalry Division refugee control policy dated July 23, 1950, reflected the same two concerns. The task of keeping innocent civilians out of harm's way was left to ROK authorities. By implication, these policies also protected refugees by attempting to ensure they were not in harm's way.

III. Key Issue 3: Tactical Situation July 22-29, 1950

Immediately after the 1st Cavalry Division disembarked in Korea, the Eighth Army directed the division to move forward to the Yongdong-Kumchon area. The 1st Cavalry Division deployed both the 5th and 8th Cavalry Regiments to defend Yongdong. The 8th Cavalry Regiment moved forward to relieve the 24th Infantry Division's 21st Infantry Regiment and to prevent the occupation of Yongdong from the northwest and southwest.¹¹ A more detailed picture of the tactical situation is found in Chapter 3. (Also, see the maps in Appendix E, which show the locations of units during the last week of July).

With the 8th Cavalry initially deployed north and west of Yongdong, the 2nd Battalion, 5th Cavalry, dug in east of the town in the vicinity of the village of Kwan ni to prevent a possible envelopment. The 1st Battalion, 5th Cavalry, remained in Hwanggan for the moment.¹²

On July 22, 1950, the 8th Cavalry received their first enemy contact in the 1st Battalion's sector northwest of Yongdong. Heavy artillery and mortar fire fell throughout the day, and reports of enemy tanks surfaced for the first time. Southwest of town, the 2nd Battalion, 8th Cavalry, area remained quiet. Artillery fire from the 11th, 77th, and 99th Field Artillery Battalions accounted for five enemy tanks and 15 other vehicles. The threat of envelopment became a real concern to the 8th Cavalry as an aerial observer saw groups of NKPA soldiers dressed in white southwest of Yongdong.¹³ The threat of envelopment meant

that the enemy would penetrate their positions and move in behind them, thus cutting them off and destroying them.

Realizing the serious danger to the 8th Cavalry, the 1st Cavalry Division ordered the regiment to disengage and withdraw to keep the NKPA from out-flanking the regiment and decisively engaging it in Yongdong. Eighth Army's strategy did not include fighting for every town and village. The Eighth Army lacked the necessary strength for that purpose. Instead, the Eighth Army opted to withdraw behind the last major defensible terrain feature, the Nakdong River. The division's withdrawal became part of this Army-level strategy. The plan called for the 5th Cavalry to support the 8th Cavalry's disengagement and rearward movement out of Yongdong to Hwanggan, where the 8th Cavalry would assume the role of the division's reserve.¹⁴ Hwanggan is approximately 2.5 road miles east of No Gun Ri.

The 7th Cavalry, meanwhile, had arrived in Korea as part of the division's second lift from Japan. The east coast of Korea suffered a determined NKPA attack, and the 1st Battalion remained in the Pohangdong area to defend the port and adjacent airfield. The remainder of the 7th Cavalry moved forward to the Yongdong area, arriving in its designated assembly area near the village Sot Anmak in the late afternoon of July 24. The 7th Cavalry's mission was to prevent enemy infiltration while also supporting the 5th Cavalry in the event the 8th Cavalry could not break contact and move east from Yongdong.¹⁵

On July 25, the 2nd Battalion, 8th Cavalry, had to break through an NKPA roadblock in order to extract themselves and reposition east of Yongdong. The 1st Battalion, 8th Cavalry, broke contact and escaped from Yongdong thanks to the division artillery's superior firepower. The 5th Cavalry withdrew from Yongdong and occupied defensive positions east of town. The day's operations proceeded as planned.¹⁶

The 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry, moved forward with elements of the Regimental Headquarters to support the withdrawal of the 8th Cavalry from Yongdong on the evening of July 25. The regiment reported its command post location to the division at 8:25 PM, giving the grid coordinates of a position directly across the road (today known as Highway 4) from the 2nd Battalion, 8th Cavalry. The 7th Cavalry Regiment's commander later reported that the 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry, had contact with 2nd Battalion, 8th Cavalry, and that the regiment had no contact with the enemy. What happened during the next several hours remains unclear, particularly with regard to the actions of the 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry.¹⁷

Several factors require careful consideration when evaluating the 7th Cavalry's performance on July 25. The 1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry, was in Pohangdong and had not yet joined the regiment, which gave the 7th a distinct disadvantage in strength. Likewise, the 7th Cavalry did not have an assignedartil-

lery battalion in direct support. July 25 was the regiment's second day in the forward area and it was in its first week in Korea. Soldiers were aware of the enemy's infiltration tactics. In the words of the commander of the 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry, refugees clogged the roads, and he heard a vehicle pass his location, possibly a tank.¹⁸ Military traffic and refugees crowded the road from Yongdong to Hwanggan, but no other reports of a tank in the rear area exist. The battalion commander most likely heard a vehicle from a withdrawing element belonging to the 8th Cavalry and not a North Korean tank. The fear of NKPA tanks may have caused the commander to identify the vehicle as a tank.

Pressure increased on the 25th Infantry Division's 27th Infantry Regiment on the right flank of the 1st Cavalry Division. Continuing the division's withdrawal became necessary to avoid a North Korean flanking movement. 1st Cavalry Division regimental operations officers arrived at the division forward command post to receive orders for the next stage of the withdrawal. Sometime during, or shortly after, this conference late on the night of July 25, the 7th Cavalry received a report that a breakthrough had occurred in the 25th Infantry Division sector to the regiment's north.¹⁹ Without specific orders and not in contact with the enemy, the 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry, began a disorganized and undisciplined withdrawal, believing that the NKPA had attacked and would envelop the battalion. The Regimental War Diary suggests that the battalion was under extreme NKPA pressure and withdrew to avoid envelopment.²⁰

It is very important to understand what was happening throughout the daylight hours of July 26 within the 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry, as they spent the day reorganizing and locating stragglers. The battalion's soldiers had abandoned a significant amount of equipment, including vital radios and crew-served weapons during their disorganized withdrawal in the early morning hours of that same day. Nearly 200 men were unaccounted for. Major Witherspoon, the Regimental S-3 (Operations Officer), set up a collection point by the roadside, probably in the vicinity of Andae Ri, and consolidated the battalion. The battalion spent the entire day going back and forth recovering the abandoned equipment and rounding up the stragglers. This activity would have placed the soldiers and their vehicles exactly in the same location west of the No Gun Ri double railroad overpass where the Korean witnesses claimed (a) the air strike occurred in the early afternoon of July 26 and (b) the Americans engaged them with machine gun fire and drove them into the double overpass. It also placed these soldiers directly to the front of 2nd Battalion, 5th Cavalry positions in the vicinity of Andae Ri and on Hill 207 throughout the entire day. 1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry, which had arrived from Pohang during the afternoon of the 26th, relieved 2nd Battalion, 5th Cavalry, later that day. Hill 207 was the high ground west of what is now Highway 4, overlooking the double railroad overpass. Other elements of the 1st Cavalry Division were also passing through the vicinity of the double railroad overpass throughout the day on the 26th as the Division executed its withdrawal to Hwanggan.

According to the 7th Cavalry Regiment War Diary, the battalion's leadership did not regain full control of the situation until 9:30 at night on July 26. After the 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry, reorganized, the soldiers dug in on a ridgeline overlooking the hamlet of No Gun Ri and across the road and railroad to the north of the 1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry.²¹ As they reorganized, they recovered much of their equipment, but 119 men remained unaccounted for.

On July 27, 1950, the division occupied positions in the Hwanggan area with the 8th Cavalry in reserve, the 5th Cavalry Regiment southwest of the town, and the 7th Cavalry Regiment to the west of town. The 7th Cavalry Regiment was the farthest forward with the 25th Infantry Division's 27th Infantry Regiment still on the 7th Cavalry's right and the 5th Cavalry Regiment to the left and rear. The 7th Cavalry Regiment was not in immediate contact with the enemy, but learned from the division that no friendly troops occupied the areas to their south and west in the direction of Yongdong. Throughout the day, patrols reported enemy forces nearby, including tanks spotted in the village of Sot Anmak in front of the 1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry, and columns of enemy troops advancing from Yongdong on the railroad tracks. In the afternoon, the regiment took fire from tanks in the vicinity of Sot Anmak; timely mortar fire drove off the NKPA armor. However, apart from some artillery and mortar fire, the day proved relatively quiet.²²

The 77th Field Artillery Battalion supported the 7th Cavalry, and the battalion commander visited the 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry, to ensure that the unit received adequate fire support. Additionally, an observer team from the Office of the Chief of Army Field Forces arrived to evaluate the state of Army units in Korea and spent the day with the 7th Cavalry.²³ A group of seven journalists, including Tom Lambert of the Associated Press and Dennis Warner of the *Daily Telegraph and London Herald* of Melbourne, also toured the 7th Cavalry's front lines.²⁴ They would have been in position to hear about an event involving refugees taking place in the immediate area. They did not report an incident involving refugees.

The 1st Cavalry Division's 6:00 PM July 27 Periodic Intelligence Report (PIR)²⁵ reported extensive NKPA patrolling to identify gaps in the division's new positions east of Yongdong. During the day on July 27, the division's artillery suffered "heavy counter battery fire." The division continued to evaluate the combat efficiency and morale of the opposing NKPA units as good. The PIR warned that the "enemy continues his standard tactic of infiltration, assembl[ing] and attack[ing] our flanks, gaps and rear areas with emphasis on dislodging the supporting artillery." The division intelligence staff evaluated this activity together with reports that enemy troops were moving out of Yongdong, suggesting that the enemy intended a double envelopment of the division.

On July 28, the situation on the 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry's right flank turned critical. The NKPA 4th Division launched an all-out attack against the

27th Infantry, forcing that regiment to tighten and contract its front-line positions. This movement opened a gap between the two divisions and offered the 3rd NKPA Division advancing from Yongdong an opportunity to outflank the 1st Cavalry Division. The 8th Cavalry, then in division reserve, counterattacked to restore the divisional boundary. The 27th Infantry also counterattacked and regained contact with the right flank of the 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry.²⁶

The risk of the NKPA cutting off the American troops was not over, however. The 1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry's Commanding Officer reported NKPA attempts to penetrate both the right and left flanks of the regiment's position throughout the day. Reports suggested that the NKPA pushed civilians, as human shields, ahead of them during their attacks. The NKPA attacked the regiment frontally, but American artillery drove the North Koreans back with great success. On July 28, Navy aircraft from the *USS Valley Forge* were directed into the area and attacked a railroad tunnel and other targets forward of the 7th Cavalry in the direction of Yongdong with bombs and machine guns.

To eliminate the growing threat of envelopment, the 7th Cavalry received orders at 8:30 PM on July 28 to withdraw to the southeast at first light on July 29. With the 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry, in the lead, the regiment passed through Hwanggan and occupied positions adjacent to the 5th Cavalry. The withdrawal of the 7th Cavalry from the vicinity of No Gun Ri early on the morning of July 29 marked the end of friendly activity in the area. The area was then under NKPA control. No U.S. troops returned to this area until after the breakout from the Nakdong River defenses in September 1950. The NKPA's first patrols entered Hwanggan later that day.²⁷

Finding: The U.S. Review Team found that, in the early morning hours of July 26, 1950, the 2nd Battalion of the 7th Cavalry Regiment, without specific orders, but believing they were being enveloped, conducted a disorganized and undisciplined withdrawal from a position east of Yongdong to the vicinity of No Gun Ri. They spent the remaining hours of July 26 until late into that night recovering abandoned personnel and equipment from the area where the air strike and machine-gun firing on Korean refugees is alleged to have occurred. On July 26, 1950, at 9:30 at night, 119 men were still unaccounted for. It will probably never be possible to reconstruct the activities of the scattered soldiers of the 2nd Battalion.

The U.S. Review Team determined that the 1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry Regiment, arrived in the vicinity of No Gun Ri in the afternoon of July 26, 1950. They relieved the 2nd Battalion, 5th Cavalry Regiment, and established their position east of the 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry Regiment.

The U.S. Review Team found that there was repeated contact reported between the 7th Cavalry and enemy forces in the vicinity of No Gun Ri on July 27 and July 28. The records indicate by this time that the 7th Cavalry had been told

that there were no friendly forces to the west and south of No Gun Ri (i.e. back toward Yongdong). The 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry, reported an enemy column on the railroad tracks on July 27, which they fired upon. On July 29, the battalion withdrew as the NKPA advanced.

The U.S. Review Team concluded that, based on the available evidence, the 7th Cavalry Regiment was under attack, as they believed, between July 27 and July 29, 1950, when in position near No Gun Ri.

IV. Key Issue 4: Assembly and Movement of Villagers

The U.S. Review Team cannot rule out the possibility that U.S. soldiers told the civilian refugees at Im Gae Ri to evacuate the village. The U.S. and ROK policy in July 1950 stated that Korean civilians (with key exceptions) should not evacuate their villages. The U.S. Review Team could not determine the reasons why the refugees gathered in Im Gae Ri; but, based on the absence of historical documentation, statements by Korean witnesses, and the lack of mention in the U.S. statements, this gathering of refugees was probably not the result of any U.S. action. The Korean statements indicate that over 400 Koreans were present in Im Gae Ri on July 25. Some of the Koreans who assembled at Im Gae Ri were from other villages and were probably unknown to the Im Gae Ri residents. Twenty-eight Korean witnesses stated that U.S. soldiers told them to evacuate Im Gae Ri on July 25. According to several Korean witnesses, soldiers warned them of potential fighting in the area through a translator. Some witnesses stated that the Americans told them that they were being moved for their safety. Some U.S. veterans remember escorting refugees from villages, but these veterans cannot remember the villages' names or the dates the evacuations occurred. Therefore, the U.S. Review Team cannot rule out the possibility that U.S. soldiers told the villagers at Im Gae Ri to evacuate the village. A detailed analysis of U.S. and Korean interviews is located in Chapter 4.

While the U.S. Review Team cannot rule out the possibility that the movement of the villagers occurred as described by the Korean witnesses, there was no sound military reason for soldiers to travel approximately three miles off their designated movement route to the village of Im Gae Ri during a hasty withdrawal for the purpose of encouraging an additional 400 refugees onto the already crowded roads and aggravating further the congested conditions. It is also unlikely that the soldiers would have performed this evacuation given the widespread knowledge and fear of North Korean infiltrators believed to be present in refugee concentrations.

Following their departure from the village of Im Gae Ri, the Korean witnesses state that they spent a night on a riverbank. Some witnesses describe what appears to be artillery firing nearby. Most Korean witnesses describe the night on the riverbank as uncomfortable. When they awoke in the morning, the soldiers were gone. Four Korean witnesses state that U.S. soldiers shot and

killed some refugees on the riverbank who attempted to leave during the night. A small number of Korean witnesses further stated that the U.S. soldiers behaved violently toward anyone who tried to leave the riverbank that night. Based upon the limited available evidence, the U.S. Review Team cannot establish if these incidents occurred as described.

Korean witness statements suggest that Korean refugees encountered U.S. forces in the vicinity of No Gun Ri as both the soldiers and the refugees moved east. Some Korean witnesses believed that the U.S. soldiers escorted them. It is possible, given the misunderstandings created by language barriers and cultural differences, that as the southward flow of refugee and military traffic merged together, soldiers and refugees moved side by side. Resultantly, the refugees may have incorrectly believed that the U.S. soldiers were escorting them. As the refugees moved toward Hwanggan, some Korean witnesses state that the U.S. soldiers directed them from the road (what is now Highway 4) onto the railroad tracks.

Three 7th Cavalry Regiment veterans recalled displacing South Koreans from unknown villages on unknown dates.²⁸ The U. S. Review Team assesses that the 7th Cavalry Regiment was not in the vicinity of Im Gae Ri on July 25 based upon official records and operational overlays of the Regiment's positions. Seven veterans of the 5th Cavalry Regiment indicated that they evacuated or escorted Korean civilians from their villages in late July and early August 1950. The veterans could not name the village. A patrol from the 5th Cavalry Regiment may have told the villagers who had assembled at Im Gae Ri to leave. In addition, 28 U.S. veterans who were interviewed remembered seeing refugees in the vicinity of No Gun Ri, but their estimate of how many is imprecise.

Generally, the veterans who remembered evacuating refugees said they evacuated civilians based upon instructions from their units' chain of command. The primary reasons the veterans cited were to improve local security and to remove the non-combatants from the combat zone for their (the refugees') own protection. All U.S. veterans stated that they never used deadly force while evacuating the civilians. Most soldiers believed that the Koreans returned to their villages as soon as the U.S. units moved out of the area. The veterans do not have detailed recollections of their actions and do not remember places, names, or dates.

As mentioned earlier, U.S. and ROK policy in July 1950, stated that Korean civilians should not evacuate their villages, and the 1st Cavalry Division Commander prohibited refugee travel by night to protect friendly troops from North Korean infiltration.²⁹ The 1st Cavalry Division Artillery reported the only documented case of 1st Cavalry Division soldiers clearing civilians from a village. On July 23, southwest of Yongdong, Division Artillery soldiers told villagers to leave their homes, which were located close to the artillery positions.³⁰

If U.S. soldiers encountered a refugee group on the road at night, these soldiers may have tried to prevent the group from moving because they feared infiltrators. The soldiers may have also tried to prohibit movement at night because this movement violated the existing U.S. refugee control policy. Also, if soldiers directed refugees off the road, this action would have been consistent with refugee control policies designed to keep the roads clear for troop movement.

Finding: The U.S. Review Team could not determine the reasons why the refugees gathered in Im Gae Ri, but the U.S. Review Team concluded that this gathering of refugees was probably not the result of U.S. action. Based on some of the available evidence, the U.S. Review Team cannot rule out the possibility that U.S. soldiers told the villagers at Im Gae Ri to evacuate the village, but the soldiers who did so were not from the 7th Cavalry Regiment.

V. Key Issue 5: Air Strikes in the Vicinity of No Gun Ri

The U.S. Review Team concluded that the air strikes / strafing during the last week of July 1950 that may have caused casualties was not the result of a pre-planned or directed strike on civilian refugees. The U.S. Review Team concluded that any air strikes / strafing that hit Korean civilians were due to misidentification of targets or that civilian casualties occurred because civilians were in the area of military targets. The U.S. Review Team's conclusions were based on witness statements, a review of official records, and the NIMA imagery analysis (Appendix C). See Chapter 3 for details of air operations in Korea.

The South Korean witness' statements collectively paint a picture of a horrific air attack occurring on July 26, 1950; but many of these witnesses do not agree on the details. They agree only on the fact that an air strike / strafing occurred as the refugee group stood upon the railroad tracks. Some U.S. veterans' statements indicated they saw some strafing. Most of the veterans could not or did not see any aircraft firing on civilians. All but one of those veterans who witnessed such a strike on civilians stated that the civilians either rode upon, or moved beside, an advancing North Korean tank or tanks.

Many Korean witnesses stated that U.S. soldiers directed the refugees onto the railroad tracks in the vicinity of No Gun Ri and then used a radio to request an immediate air strike on the group. The Korean witness statements do not agree on all the details surrounding the air strike or strafing. Ten of the witnesses mention seeing a radio in use among the U.S. soldiers.³¹ The air attack's timing may have led them later to perceive incorrectly a connection between the radio operator and the aircraft.³² By contrast, a large number of the witnesses, 34 out of 49, stated that a strafing attack hit the refugees on the railroad tracks.³³ Many Korean witness accounts of the air strike / strafing indicate that more than one aircraft was involved in the attack. In response to some U.S. questions, several witnesses described the attacking aircraft as jets as opposed to propel-

ler-driven aircraft.³⁴ In addition, some Korean statements simply state that some type of high explosive ordnance fell upon the refugees. Three Korean witnesses clearly mentioned that the planes used on-board machine-guns in addition to the bombs.³⁵ At least three witnesses suggested that the aircraft made several passes on the group.³⁶

The Korean descriptions of the air strike / strafing are compelling. One eight-year-old witness never mentions bombs or aircraft, but instead remembers flames everywhere searing his face and bullets piercing his legs.³⁷ An eleven-year-old witness remembers machine-gun bullets riddling her mother's legs, while at the same time losing her left eye from an explosion.³⁸ A witness who was an 18- or 19-year-old adult at the time recounts that the explosions blew a large piece of flesh onto him; his own injuries left him barely able to walk.³⁹

An investigation of the Air Force's documented role during this period of the Korean War yielded no evidence to suggest that Air Force aircraft strafed Korean refugees or enemy soldiers at, or near, No Gun Ri on July 26, 1950. The U.S. Air Force History Team found most mission reports for jet aircraft flying missions over Korea on July 26, 1950. However, the Fifth Air Force final recapitulation report for the day shows no target struck in the vicinity of No Gun Ri on July 26.⁴⁰

The only documented USAF air strike in the immediate vicinity of Hwanggan area occurred southwest of No Gun Ri on July 27. This was a friendly fire incident in which an F-80 accidentally strafed the 1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry Regiment's command post at 7:15 in the morning. A Fifth Air Force ADVON message acknowledged that the plane was a F-80 from one of the 35th Fighter-Bomber Squadron's first three missions of the day (call sign Contour). The 8th Fighter-Bomber Wing fragmentary order for July 27, 1950, matched the F-80 squadron mission summary reports; the requirements and take-off times agreed with each other. The F-80 strafed a "wooden area into which many vehicle tracks were leading", undoubtedly the 1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry's command post. The strafing destroyed two U.S. trucks but claimed no lives. As a result of the careful scheduling of the air assets, as expressed in the daily frag order, 5th Air Force ADVON could, within a half-hour, identify the aircraft involved. If a similar incident occurred on July 26, it would have been detected and reported as was the one on July 27.

The Navy discovered no evidence of naval aircraft operating in the vicinity of No Gun Ri on July 26 or 27. However, on July 28, Navy aircraft from the *USS Valley Forge* were directed into the area and attacked a railroad tunnel and other targets forward of the 7th Cavalry in the direction of Yongdong with bombs and machine guns.

At least 10 of the Korean witnesses stated that they observed a U.S. soldier using a radio to call for the air strike. It is important to note that an ordinary

ground soldier could not talk directly to a T-6 and request an air strike. Only the TACP with the jeep-mounted AN/VRC-1 radios could talk to the Air Force elements, including the strike aircraft. At best, the infantry or cavalry soldier carried a hand-held “walkie-talkie” radio or the larger backpack SCR-300 radio. To request an air strike, an Army unit, usually at the battalion level or higher, passed a request up through Army channels to the Joint Operations Center; the Joint Operations Center would validate the request and pass it to the Tactical Air Control Center (Mellow). This process included Mellow checking with the deployed Tactical Air Control Parties (ground-based U.S. Air Force elements that controlled U.S. Air Force close air-support missions), Mosquitoes, and Army liaison aircraft to acknowledge the target and direct the next available F-80 jets, propeller-driven F-51s, or Navy aircraft to attack the target. This procedure was slow. A moving target could easily have vanished between the time a ground soldier reported something up through channels and an aircraft arrived.⁴¹ There was only one Tactical Air Control Party (TACP) operating in support of the 1st Cavalry Division during this period of time. This TACP was not located in the vicinity of No Gun Ri during the period of July 26 to July 29, 1950. The accidental air strike on the 1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry Regiment, caused the 7th Cavalry Regimental Commander to request immediately that he be assigned a Tactical Air Control Party in order to control aircraft in his area and to preclude further friendly fire incidents.⁴²

The U.S. Air Force History Team found 8th Tactical Reconnaissance Squadron film of the No Gun Ri area dated August 6 and September 19, 1950. The Air Force Team showed this film to four retired photo interpreters of national reputation. All of these interpreters agree that there is evidence of probable bomb craters in the vicinity of the various tunnel openings to the west of No Gun Ri near Yongdong. They also state that the film shows no signs of bombing or strafing on the railroad tracks just west of No Gun Ri. A National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA) photo interpreter maintains that some patterns near the tracks approximately 350 yards from the double railroad overpass show “an imagery signature of probable strafing” but no bomb damage. The NIMA interpreter's view specifically states that probable strafing occurred in two locations along the western track bed. One of these locations coincides with the location identified by the Korean witnesses as the area where they were strafed. The four retired photo interpreters disagree with this conclusion. Determining the exact date when this damage occurred is not possible, but the NIMA interpreters' viewpoint is that some evidence exists to suggest that an air strike could have occurred in late July in the vicinity of No Gun Ri.⁴³

If the air strike occurred as described by the Koreans, and if American soldiers fired on the Koreans as they were taking cover under the double railroad overpass, the Koreans moved across open ground for a distance of approximately 300 meters. Their movement would have been directly into the line of fire from American soldiers in the vicinity of the double railroad overpass. What is more likely is that, if the civilians were receiving fire from the vicinity of the double

overpass, they would have moved west, away from the incoming fire and away from the double railroad overpass in the vicinity of No Gun Ri. This movement would have placed the civilians behind the safety of a ridgeline and out of the alleged line of fire.

Interviews with U.S. Army veterans also suggest the possibility that an air strike / strafing may have occurred on July 26, 1950, but only one veteran could give a date while the others could not provide dates. Sixteen U.S. veterans interviewed said they saw what they believed were U.S. aircraft on strafing runs.⁴⁴ The breakdown of what the veterans saw is as follows: Ten veterans did not see the target strafed. Only six veterans could identify the target that the aircraft strafed. Of these six, two veterans identified the target as a tank that had people, perhaps refugees, moving near it or riding on the tank's outer hull. One veteran said refugees mixed with an enemy column were strafed,⁴⁵ and one veteran said he saw refugees strafed in July - August 1950. Finally, two veterans from the 7th Cavalry Regiment said their own position was hit by strafing and in fact they were strafed on July 27, 1950.

Although some U.S. veteran's statements indicate they saw strafing, other U.S. veteran' statements support the U.S. Review Team' s conclusion that soldiers could not have called for an air strike. In their statements, U.S. veterans said communications were very difficult, and at times they did not have radio communication with Battalion and Regiment due to equipment shortages (batteries). In late July they relied primarily on landlines. One veteran stated his company could not have communicated with aircraft given their equipment.

The statements of the U.S. pilots interviewed do not support the description given by the Korean witnesses of the air strike / strafing. Several U.S. Air Force veteran pilots that the U.S. Review Team interviewed remembered the name Yongdong and knew that they flew missions there on July 26, 1950. None of these veterans remembered any mission resembling the alleged events in the vicinity of No Gun Ri. Sixteen of the 17 U.S. Air Force veterans interviewed believed that the NKPA soldiers were infiltrating civilian refugee groups. At least five pilots interviewed visually confirmed that this infiltration was taking place.⁴⁶ A Tactical Air Control Party (TACP) veteran regularly observed NKPA soldiers dressed in civilian clothing.⁴⁷ Several pilots stated that they would have refused any orders to strafe civilians intentionally, although they never received any such orders.

No USAF veteran that the U.S. Review Team interviewed participated in, or had any knowledge of anyone participating in, the strafing of civilians in the vicinity of No Gun Ri in late July 1950. U.S. Air Force interviewees vividly recalled stern verbal policies implemented to prevent the attack of non-combatants; although no one recalled any written policies on this subject. Furthermore, all pilots interviewed stated that the visibility from their F-51, F-80, and T-6 cockpits was excellent. Although visibility was good, nearly all pilots interviewed (espe-

cially F-80 pilots) said that distinguishing between enemy troops and friendly forces proved very difficult or impossible, primarily as a result of the high air-speeds flown. None of the U.S. Air Force veterans interviewed had heard of any incident in the vicinity of No Gun Ri until the recent media coverage.

Finding: An exhaustive search of U.S. Air Force and U.S. Navy records, and interviews with U.S. pilots did not identify an air strike in the No Gun Ri area on July 26, 1950. The number of Korean witness statements describing the strafing and the photograph interpretation by NIMA does not permit the U.S. Review Team to exclude the possibility that U.S. or allied aircraft might have hit civilian refugees in the vicinity of No Gun Ri during an air strike/ strafing on July 26, 1950. On July 27, 1950, an air strike did in fact occur on the 1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry's position near No Gun Ri that both the Air Force and Army recorded in official documents. On July 28, there was also an air strike on NPKA forces near 1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry Regiment. If Korean civilians were near the positions of these strikes, they could have been injured.

The U.S. Review Team concluded that strafing may have occurred near No Gun Ri in the last week of July 1950 and could have injured or killed Korean civilians but that any such air strikes were not deliberate attacks on Korean civilians. The U. S. Review Team concluded that any air strikes / strafing occurring on July 26 took place under the same conditions as the air strikes / strafing on July 27, specifically an accidental air strike / strafing caused by the misidentification of targets and not a pre-planned strike. An accidental air strike / strafing could have happened due to several factors: target misidentification, lack of reliable communications, absence of a Tactical Air Control Party in the 7th Regiment, and the fluid nature of the battlefield. It was not a pre-planned strike on civilian refugees.

VI. Key Issue 6: Ground Fire in the Vicinity of No Gun Ri

The U.S. Review Team concluded that ground fire, including small-arms, artillery, and mortar fire, hit and injured or killed some Korean refugees in the vicinity of No Gun Ri during the last week of July, 1950. The U.S. Review Team's research found no official records describing the shooting of a large number of refugees in the No Gun Ri area during the last week of July 1950.

Some U.S. and Korean witness statements indicate that U.S. ground forces fired toward refugees in the vicinity of No Gun Ri during the period July 26-29, 1950, as discussed below. Briefly, the Korean description of the events on July 26, 1950, is that refugees were strafed or bombed on the road. Some fled the area or hid in ditches and others went into the double railroad overpass tunnel where they were fired upon from different locations, for a period of up to four days, with the heaviest fire occurring on July 26 (which was the first day they report spending in the double railroad overpass). See Chapter 3 for details on U.S. tactical operations.

On the afternoon of July 26, 1950, the 1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry, replaced the 2nd Battalion, 5th Cavalry, in the vicinity of Hill 207 near the village of Andae Ri. Records of the 5th Cavalry for July 26-29 indicate no incident involving refugees.⁴⁸ The 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry Regiment, was reorganizing on July 26, after a disorganized night withdrawal from a location east of Yongdong to the vicinity of No Gun Ri. The 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry Regiment, completed this reorganization at about 9:30 PM on July 26; however, 119 men were still unaccounted for. It took a position on the ridgeline overlooking the hamlet of No Gun Ri and across the road (what is now Highway 4) from 1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry Regiment. In order for soldiers from the 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry Regiment, to reach their position on the ridgeline as they reorganized, they would have used this road. If there was heavy firing from the higher ground above the road into the double railroad overpass, soldiers from the 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry Regiment, would have also been in the path of that fire.

On July 27, the 1st Cavalry Division informed the 7th Cavalry Regiment that no friendly troops were operating to their south or west. The 7th Cavalry Regiment would then have considered movement to their front as probable North Korean activity. Therefore, the regiment may have believed that, with the possible exception of a friendly patrol, nothing but the enemy existed between them and Yongdong.

The reported position of the 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry Regiment, on the ridgeline overlooking the village of No Gun Ri is inconsistent with the positions the veterans remember occupying. Some veterans described positions that are on the opposite side of the road (Highway 4) in the area initially occupied by the 2nd Battalion, 5th Cavalry, and later on the 26th by the 1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry Regiment. While the U.S. Review Team cannot resolve this inconsistency, there are some possible explanations. Some soldiers from the 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry Regiment, were unaccounted for following the disorganized withdrawal on the night of July 25 / 26. They may have dug into the positions they described for some period of time, possibly temporarily mixing in with another unit. Some soldiers may simply have dug in the wrong positions on the other side of the road near Hill 207, even after the reorganization. The veterans may also have been confused as to the north / south orientation of the area. At this time, the unit was retreating along the road, which ran to the northeast, not toward what most of them believed was the south. The veteran's memories may also be flawed and confused. After the passage of 50 years, some inconsistencies will never be explained.

U.S. veterans from the 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry Regiment, described several terrain features in the vicinity of No Gun Ri, including a double railroad overpass, single culvert, and a single tunnel.⁴⁹ The only way the directional orientation of their descriptions can be correct is if one assumes that they were at those positions on Hill 207 instead of along the ridgeline overlooking the village

of No Gun Ri in the 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry Regiment's reported position. Given the degree of disorganization of the battalion, some soldiers, including possibly some of the 119 men missing, may not have been at their battalion's reported position. Korean witnesses describe these same terrain features. The features are also shown on the August 6, 1950, U.S. Air Force aerial reconnaissance photograph.

In interviews, twelve U.S. veterans stated that firing of various types including machinegun, mortar, and rifle firing occurred near unidentified people in civilian clothing outside the tunnels/ bridges in the vicinity of No Gun Ri (See Chapter 4). Some veterans stated that they fired over the heads of civilians to prevent movement toward U.S. positions. Some veterans stated that they observed U.S. fire as a response to perceived hostile fire from the refugee positions in the double railroad overpass and elsewhere. Three veterans remembered seeing fire from U.S. soldiers directed at a double railway overpass. Some veterans also remember intermittent NKPA and U.S. artillery and mortar fires throughout this period.

In all of the U.S. interviews, the firing described occurs for short periods of time (less than 60 minutes), unlike the descriptions of some Korean witnesses that the firing continued up to four days. However, there is no indication that anything resembling mass killings took place. The U.S. veterans did not receive orders to kill civilian refugees. Some U.S. veterans received an order to stop refugees and not to let them pass at No Gun Ri. As a result of that order, soldiers fired over the heads or in front of refugees to prevent their movement. Soldiers also fired in response to perceived hostile fire. The issuance of orders is discussed in Finding 7. Finally, the events as described in the U.S. witness interviews could not have caused the large number of casualties attributed by Korean witnesses to the ground fire at the double railroad overpass.

Based on interviews, the U.S. Review Team found that soldiers believed that they could take action in self-defense. Soldiers believed they could fire when fired upon or when they perceived hostile intent. Some of the ground fire was in self-defense; that is, in response to perceived hostile fire.

Some Korean witnesses estimated that the firing in the vicinity of No Gun Ri, which they state occurred during the day and night, lasted up to four days. Some Korean witnesses statements provide a range of times for the duration of the events at the double overpass from three to five days, but the statements are not consistent and the estimates of the duration of the event do not corroborate each other. The Korean statements suggest there were a large number of casualties, and a number of Koreans state that U.S. soldiers offered them assistance or medical aid.

Korean witnesses describe the same terrain features as the U.S. veterans, but Korean accounts focus on the double railroad overpass. Korean witnesses

stated that there was heavy firing on the double railroad overpass from U.S. soldiers on the afternoon of July 26. Some Korean witnesses stated that they went under the double railroad overpass after being strafed on the railroad track above it but that others also fled the area. After entering the tunnel, Korean witnesses state that they received heavy fire from outside the tunnel for an undetermined number of days. They remained prone in the tunnel to avoid being hit by weapons firing into the tunnel. Most of the deaths occurred on the first day; at some point, some younger men and children escaped from the tunnel. Nine Korean witnesses believed that the firing was coming from the hill above the overpass. Other descriptions imply that firing was coming from both sides of the tunnel.

Multiple Korean witnesses said that soldiers came to the tunnel to check on the civilians on the first day. Yet this is also the day on which the Korean witnesses indicated that they received the heaviest fire that killed many people and the day, on which they remained prone on the tunnel floor, placing bodies at the entrances of the tunnels to shield people in the tunnel. It is also the day on which two Korean witnesses indicate that soldiers transported Koreans from the tunnel in a jeep and on a truck. The U.S. Review Team cannot explain these inconsistencies.

In the Korean description of the events at No Gun Ri, Korean witnesses state that at some point younger men and children escaped over the mountain in the dark, and only women, children, and the elderly remained under the railroad overpass. If, as some Korean statements imply, both openings of the tunnel were covered by weapons fire during the day and night, the escape to either the west or east was unlikely. If, however, the firing was brief and sporadic, people could have fled the tunnel area.

A more plausible explanation of events, based on the available evidence, is that there was sporadic firing on July 26, as described above, for very short periods of time; there was much more intense fire beginning on July 27 as the 1st Cavalry Division retreated and the NKPA advanced toward Hwanggan. Official records indicate that the NKPA attacked the 7th Cavalry on July 27 and 28, and the 7th Cavalry employed every means at its disposal to defend itself, including the use of small-arms fire, mortars, and artillery.

Even after the heaviest documented fighting, the aerial reconnaissance photograph of August 6, 1950, shows no bodies, animal carcasses, or signs of graves in the vicinity of the double overpass (See Appendix B, Tab 3, and Appendix C). Some Korean witnesses stated they recalled returning to the area to look for family members during the period of early to mid-August and that there were numerous bodies in the area. Fighting positions and vehicle tracks are visible in the aerial photograph while human and animal remains are not.

Forensic examinations of the site around the double railroad overpass found bullets and bullet marks that were analyzed. Analysis of the bullets found

in the area of the double railroad overpass showed they were of U.S. manufacture. Soviet bullets were also found in the area. The bullets could have come from U.S. weapons or captured U.S. weapons being used by NKPA soldiers who passed through this area. U.S. Forces moved back through this area in September 1950. For a review of the forensic work, see Appendix C, Tab 2.

Finding: Although the U.S. Review Team cannot determine what happened near No Gun Ri with certainty, it is clear, based upon all available evidence, that an unknown number of Korean civilians were killed or injured by the effects of small-arms fire, artillery and mortar fire, and strafing that preceded or coincided with the NKPA's advance and the withdrawal of U.S. forces in the vicinity of No Gun Ri during the last week of July 1950. These Korean deaths and injuries occurred at different locations in the vicinity of No Gun Ri and were not concentrated exclusively at the double railroad overpass.

Some U.S. veterans describe fire that lasted for a few to fifteen minutes. Some Korean witnesses describe fire day and night on the tunnel for as long as four days. Because Korean estimates of the length of time they spent in the tunnel are so inconsistent, the U.S. Review Team drew no conclusion about the amount of time they spent in the tunnel.

The firing was a result of hostile fire seen or received from civilian positions or fire directed over their heads or near them to control their movement. The deaths and injuries of civilians, wherever they occurred, were an unfortunate tragedy inherent to war and not a deliberate killing.

VII. Key Issue 7: Issuance of Orders to Fire on Refugees

The U.S. Review Team interviewers asked the U.S. veterans if they received orders or heard orders given to shoot civilian refugees. The veterans interviewed stated that they were not given orders to fire on refugees, and they did not hear orders to fire on refugees. However, the U.S. Review Team found that U.S. soldiers were given an order to stop the refugees or not let the refugees pass. In the absence of any other guidance this order could have been misunderstood or misconstrued. A more extensive review of the U.S. veterans' statements is found in Chapter 4.

Most U.S. veterans did not believe they were authorized to use deadly force against civilian refugees. Several veterans who received the instruction / order "do not let refugees pass" either "assumed" or "believed" that if the refugees tried to pass, they could use deadly force. A platoon leader who said that deadly force was not authorized against refugees also knew of the instruction "do not let the refugees pass." The platoon leader said that a soldier might have misunderstood this instruction and believed he could use deadly force to prevent civilian refugees from passing if they did not stop when directed to do so.

In interviews with the U.S. Review Team, several veterans stated they assumed there was an order to fire on civilians because artillery and mortar fires were used that may have hit civilians.⁵⁰ These veterans were adamant that there was an order, but they had no information to support their assertions. When interviewed, the veterans did not know who gave the order, they did not hear the order, they did not know when the order was given, and they personally did not receive the order.

Some U.S. veteran interviews indicate that U.S. ground forces fired at or towards civilians in the vicinity of No Gun Ri during the period July 26 - 29, 1950. The reasons the soldiers took these actions are discussed in the next two paragraphs.

Some firing at civilians occurred because soldiers said that they were told to keep the civilians pinned down or stopped. Two soldiers said they fired shots over their heads to keep the civilians from moving; they were not ordered to target and fire on the civilians. The only reference to orders prompting these actions was the order that the refugees were to be stopped or would not be allowed to approach and pass through friendly positions.

Several other veterans stated they observed firing at the civilians in response to perceived hostile fire from the positions near the double railroad overpass and elsewhere. Based on veteran's interviews, the U.S. Review Team found that soldiers believed that they could take action in self-defense against civilians; that is, if they were fired upon or if they saw actions that indicated hostile intent. Some veterans said they observed firing in the direction of the double railroad overpass in response to fire from that location. Return fire in this case would have been an action in self-defense, and no orders were required. The U.S. soldiers were repeatedly warned that North Korean soldiers wore civilian clothing over their uniforms in order to infiltrate U.S. positions. The U.S. soldiers were also told that North Korean soldiers would hide within refugee columns.

Former officers of the 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry Regiment, that the U.S. Review Team interviewed remain adamant that the battalion commander issued no order to fire on refugees at any time. One former member of the battalion believed he saw a small group of civilians on the railroad tracks and that soldiers fired warning shots over their heads to stop them and keep them away from the battalion's position.

While conducting research, the U.S. Review Team found four references containing entries regarding actions against civilians.

The first reference was an abbreviated message which appeared in the 8th Cavalry Regiment message log dated 10:00 AM on July 24, 1950, that stated: "No refugees to cross the frontline. Fire everyone trying to cross the lines. Use discretion in case of women and children." This message did not

constitute an order from the 1st Cavalry Division to fire upon Korean civilians at No Gun Ri. There is no evidence that this message was retransmitted to, or received by subordinate units within the 8th Cavalry Regiment.

The 7th Cavalry Regiment was the unit in the vicinity of No Gun Ri on July 26. By July 26, 1950, the last elements of the 8th Cavalry Regiment were withdrawing from the vicinity of No Gun Ri to the division rear near Hwanggan. The U.S. Review Team found no evidence that the 8th Cavalry message was transmitted to the 5th or 7th Cavalry Regiments or any other subordinate element of the division.

The policy set by the 1st Cavalry Division Commander in his order of July 23, 1950, titled "Control of Refugee Movement" makes no mention of the use of force by soldiers. It stated: "Municipal authorities, local police and the National Police will enforce this directive." The U.S. Review Team concluded that the 8th Cavalry Regiment log entry did not constitute an order to fire upon Korean civilians at No Gun Ri.

The second reference was a 25th Infantry Division Commander's memorandum to commanders, issued on July 27, 1950. On the 25th of July, 1950, the 25th ID Activities Report stated: "Refugees and Korean Civilians were ordered out of the combat zone in order to eliminate possible serious traffic problems and to aid in blocking the infiltration of North Korean Forces through the lines. These instructions were passed to the civilians through the Korean Police."⁵¹ The July 27, 1950 memo to Commanders reads: "Korean police have been directed to remove all civilians from the area between the blue lines shown on the attached overlay and report the evacuation has been accomplished. All civilians seen in this area are to be considered as enemy and action taken accordingly."⁵² The area "between the blue lines" was in front of the 25th Infantry Division's main line of defense -- no-man's-land at best -- an area about to be occupied by the enemy. Two things are clear: actions had been taken in conjunction with the Korean National Police to clear the civilians out of the danger area; and, those actions were intended to ensure that noncombatants would not find themselves in harms way when the advancing NKPA subsequently made contact along the Division's front. After the area was deemed to be cleared, anyone caught in civilian clothes and suspected of being an enemy agent was to be turned over to the Counter Intelligence Corps, and not to the Korean Police immediately. There is nothing to suggest any summary measures were considered against refugees, or people dressed like them. The 25th Infantry Division was not in the vicinity of No Gun Ri.

The third reference was a memorandum, written by Major General (Retired) Turner C. Rogers, then Colonel Rogers, the Deputy Chief for Operations, Advanced Headquarters Fifth Air Force, to his commander on July 25, 1950, with the following subject: Policy on Strafing Civilian Refugees. This memorandum is not an order. It is a written record reflecting one officer's concerns about the

strafing of civilians. Some people have interpreted the memorandum to mean that blanket orders to fire on civilians existed. The U.S. Review Team does not agree with this interpretation.

The memorandum was prepared a few days after Colonel Rogers arrived in Korea. The memorandum expressed Colonel Rogers' concern about an unspecified Army request to strafe civilians approaching U.S. positions and recommended a policy be established "whereby Fifth Air Force aircraft will not attack civilian refugees, unless they are definitely known to contain North Korean soldiers or commit hostile acts." The recommended policy appears to be the practice followed by the USAF pilots the U.S. Team interviewed. Pilots sought out targets such as trucks, tanks, moving troops,⁵³ and groups of men in uniform.⁵⁴ The pilots fired when they were told a target was hostile⁵⁵ and fired back when fired upon.⁵⁶

Despite the memorandum by Colonel Rogers, no USAF veteran that the U.S. Review Team interviewed participated in, or had any knowledge of anyone participating in, the strafing of civilians in the vicinity of No Gun Ri in late July 1950. U.S. Air Force interviewees vividly recalled stern verbal policies implemented to prevent the attack of non-combatants, although no one recalled any written policies on this subject. No USAF veteran that the U.S. Review Team interviewed participated in, or had any knowledge of anyone participating in, the strafing of civilians in the vicinity of No Gun Ri in late July 1950. Furthermore, all pilots interviewed stated that the visibility from their F-51, F-80, and T-6 cockpits was excellent. Although visibility was good, nearly all pilots interviewed (especially F-80 pilots) said that distinguishing between enemy troops and friendly forces proved very difficult or impossible, primarily as a result of the high airspeeds flown. None of the U.S. Air Force veterans interviewed had heard of any incident in the vicinity of No Gun Ri until the recent media coverage.

The U.S. Review Team interviewed Major General Rogers, but he did not remember the July 25, 1950, memo and did not remember any details about his duty position at Advance Headquarters Fifth Air Force.⁵⁷

The fourth entry the U.S. Review Team found was a statement similar to the Colonel Rogers' memorandum in an extract from the Aircraft Carrier *Valley Forge* Activity Summary, a Navy document describing operations conducted on July 25, 1950:

Several groups of fifteen to twenty people dressed in white were sighted. The first group was strafed in accordance with information received from the Army that groups of more than eight to ten people were to be considered troops, and were to be attacked. Since the first pass indicated that the people seemed to be

civilians, other groups were investigated by non-firing runs.⁵⁸

Like the U.S. Air Force's official records, no documentary evidence exists that shows that Navy aircraft willfully attacked civilian targets. A study of the command histories and after-action reports held by the Naval Historical Center indicates that the only units available for missions on July 26, Attack Squadron Fifty-Five (VA-55) and Fighter Squadron Fifty-Three (VF-53), were not used near No Gun Ri. Both squadrons deployed aboard the Aircraft Carrier *Valley Forge* (CV 45) as part of Carrier Air Group Five (CVG-5) from May 1 through December 1, 1950. In addition, the Navy leadership, down to the individual pilot, recognized fully the presence of civilians in the war zone, and leaders at each level of command acted to avoid engaging these non-combatants.⁵⁹

Since both the Rogers' memorandum and this document are dated July 25, 1950, it is possible that they are referencing a single discussion in the Joint Operations Center, where both USAF and USN operations officers were co-located. The Navy statement reinforces the judgment that pilots were expected to exercise between selecting targets and the Army's desire to target NKPA troops wearing white, not noncombatants.

During the U.S. Review Team's research, no other documents or policy directives relating to the COL Rogers' memorandum or the U.S. Navy extract, such as the originating Army request for strafing action or any implementing documents prepared in reply to Colonel Rogers' memorandum, were located. After the passage of 50 years, determining why this memorandum was written is impossible.

Finding: Based upon the available evidence and despite some conflicting statements and misunderstandings, the U.S. Review Team concluded that U.S. commanders did not issue oral or written orders to shoot and kill Korean civilians during the last week of July 1950 in the vicinity of No Gun Ri.

A veteran stated that soldiers could have misunderstood the order not to let refugees pass or to stop refugees. Some veterans did believe that if a civilian would not stop, they could use deadly force to prevent civilians from passing.

Some veterans stated that there was an order to shoot civilians at No Gun Ri but had no information to support their assertions. These soldiers did not know who gave the order, did not hear the order, did not know when the order was given, and personally did not receive the order. As a result, the U.S. Review Team concluded that these veterans assumed that an order was given because artillery and mortars were fired. The U.S. Review Team also considered media statements quoting veterans who claimed that an order to shoot Korean civilians was given at No Gun Ri. The U.S. Review Team was unable to confirm these

reports because the witnesses either were not at No Gun Ri at the time or refused to speak to the U.S. Army.

Although the U.S. Review Team found four references (entry in the 8th Cavalry Regiment Message Log, 25th Infantry Division Commander's order, Colonel Rogers' memorandum, and an extract from the U.S. Navy's Aircraft Carrier *Valley Forge* Activity Summary) discussing actions against civilians, it did not find evidence of an order given to soldiers by a U.S. commander, orally or in writing, to kill Korean civilians in the vicinity of No Gun Ri in the last week of July 1950.

VIII. Key Issue 8: Number of Korean Deaths and Injuries

The U.S. Review Team cannot conclusively determine the number of Korean deaths and injuries resulting from U.S. combat action in the vicinity of No Gun Ri. During meetings with the U.S. Review Team, ROK Review Team on August 3, 2000 and November 3, 2000 reported an unverified number of 248 casualties, which they stated was provided to them by the Yongdong County Office. The ROK Steering Group, at a meeting on December 7, 2000, in Seoul, ROK, repeated that the unverified number of casualties was 248. The initial Associated Press articles reported hundreds of people killed.⁶⁰

Korean witness statements contain different estimates of how many people were killed or injured and how the bodies were buried. These witness statements described refugees piling dead bodies at the entrances of the tunnel,⁶¹ dead cows on the railroad tracks,⁶² bodies scattered near the railroad tracks,⁶³ and dozens of people dying.⁶⁴ Six Korean witnesses described the use of a mass grave or heard that a mass grave near the double tunnels was used.⁶⁵ Seven Korean witnesses said that they returned to the tunnel area four to seven days after the incident to recover bodies.⁶⁶ These witnesses said they saw some or many dead decomposing bodies in the area and that some bodies had been temporarily buried.⁶⁷ One Korean witness reported that refugee bodies from villages other than Im Gae Ri and Joo Gok Ri were not buried until mid August.⁶⁸ Despite these reports, no bodies or animal carcasses, or signs of the decomposition of bodies, were observed on the August 6, 1950, U.S. Air Force aerial reconnaissance photograph that was analyzed by the National Imagery and Mapping Agency and the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology. Some Korean statements describe only the deaths or injuries of family members,⁶⁹ and others only estimate the total number of deaths and injuries.⁷⁰ Korean witness estimates range between 60 -100 dead in the double tunnel and 50 - 150 dead or injured from strafing / bombing.⁷¹ An evaluation of Korean and U.S. veteran witness statements is found in Chapter 4.

The U.S. Review Team's research revealed no official records of refugee deaths or injuries in the vicinity of No Gun Ri between July 26 and July 29, 1950. Some U.S. veterans describe dead or injured civilians.⁷² These estimates range

from a few to a single veteran who gave a number of 200. The soldiers did not check bodies, and some estimates appear to be guesswork or not related to this incident. Most U.S. veterans who passed through the vicinity of No Gun Ri in late July 1950 during their withdrawal toward the Naktong River did not observe human or animal remains or graves in the area.⁷³ The U.S. Review Team believes that it is unlikely that hundreds of dead bodies were present in the vicinity of No Gun Ri during the last week of July 1950 based on the statements of U.S. veterans and the examination of the August 6, 1950, aerial photograph by the National Imagery and Mapping Agency and the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology.⁷⁴

Finding: Based on the available evidence, the U.S. Review Team is unable to determine the number of Korean civilians who were killed or injured in the vicinity of No Gun Ri. During their investigation, the ROK Review Team reported that the Korean survivors' organization claimed an unverified number of 248 South Korean civilians killed, injured, or missing in the vicinity of No Gun Ri between July 25 and 29, 1950. This report was recorded by the Yongdong County Office. The ROK Steering Group, at a ROK-U.S. Steering Group meeting on December 6-7, 2000, in Seoul, ROK, reiterated the claim of 248 casualties.

The actual number of Korean casualties cannot be derived from the U.S. veteran statements and Korean witness statements. The U.S. Team believes that number to be lower than the Korean claim. An aerial reconnaissance photograph of the No Gun Ri area taken on August 6, 1950, shows no indication of human remains or mass graves in the vicinity of the No Gun Ri double railroad overpass. Korean burial customs, farming in the area, lack of reliable information, wartime disruptions of the countryside, and the passage of time preclude an accurate determination of the numbers involved.

Conclusion

During late July 1950, Korean civilians were caught between withdrawing U.S. forces and attacking enemy forces. As a result of U.S. actions during the Korean War in the last week of July 1950, Korean civilians were killed and injured in the vicinity of No Gun Ri. The U.S. Review Team did not find that the Korean deaths and injuries occurred exactly as described in the Korean account. To appraise these events, it is necessary to recall the circumstances of the period. U.S. forces on occupation duty in Japan, mostly without training for, or experience in, combat were suddenly ordered to join ROK forces in defending against a determined assault by well-armed and well-trained NKPA forces employing both conventional and guerilla warfare tactics. The U.S. troops had to give up position after position. In the week beginning July 25, 1950, the 1st Cavalry Division, withdrawing from Yongdong toward the Naktong River, passed through the vicinity of No Gun Ri. Earlier, roads and trails in South Korea had been choked with civilians fleeing south. Disguised NKPA soldiers had mingled with these refugees. U.S. and ROK commanders had published a policy designed to limit the

threat from NKPA infiltrators, to protect U.S. forces from attacks from the rear, and to prevent civilians from interfering with the flow of supplies and troops. The ROK National Police were supposed to control and strictly limit the movements of innocent refugees.

In these circumstances, especially given the fact that many of the U.S. soldiers lacked combat-experienced officers and noncommissioned officers, some soldiers may have fired out of fear in response to a perceived enemy threat without considering the possibility that they might be firing on Korean civilians.

Neither the documentary evidence nor the U.S. veterans' statements reviewed by the U.S. Review Team support a hypothesis of deliberate killing of Korean civilians. What befell civilians in the vicinity of No Gun Ri in late July 1950 was a tragic and deeply regrettable accompaniment to a war forced upon unprepared U.S. and ROK forces.

Endnotes

-
- ¹ Book 2, Combat Effectiveness Reports 1st Quarter, and Book 3, Combat Effectiveness Reports 2nd Quarter, enclosures to Headquarters Eighth U.S. Army, Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3, "Command Report G-3 Section, 1 January 1950 thru 30 June 1950," Box P726, Historical Section, Eighth United States Army, RG 338, NARA.
- ² War diary, 1st Cavalry Division, June-July 1950. In the Records of U. S. Army Commands, Cavalry Divisions 1940-1967, Box 131, RG 338, NARA.
- ³ Department of the Army Pamphlet No. 20-105, *Army Four-Hour Pre-Combat Orientation Course (Korea)*, August 1950. In Army Intelligence Decimal Files 1950, Entry 2A, Box 572, RG 319, NARA.
- ⁴ Narrative Historical Report, 25th Infantry Division, 8-31 Jul 50. In AG Command Reports (War Diaries) 1949-1954, 25th Infantry Division History Jul 50, Entry 429, Box 3746, RG 407, NARA.
- ⁵ Memorandum, Headquarters (HQs) 1st Cavalry Division (1CD), 23 Jul 50, sub: Control of Refugee Movement. In Records of U.S. Army Commands, Cavalry Divisions 1940-1967, 1st Cavalry Division, Box 127, RG 338, NARA; see Chapter 2 of this report for a more detailed discussion of the refugee control policies.
- ⁶ Informal Check Slip, Eighth United States Army Korea (EUSAK) HQs, 26 Jul 50, sub: Control of Refugees. In Records of U.S. Army Commands, 8th Army Adjutant General Section 1944-1956, Security-Classified General Correspondence 1950, Box 729, RG 338, NARA.
- ⁷ Message, EUSAK, CNR: G 20578 KGP, 26 Jul 50, sub: Controlled Movement of All Refugees, In Records of U.S. Army Commands, Korean Military Advisory Group, Box 23, RG 338, NARA.
- ⁸ Intelligence Instruction No. 4, EUSAK, 27 Jul 50. In Records of the Army Staff, Army Intelligence Project Decimal Files 1951-1952, Korea, Entry 47G, Box 163, RG 319, NARA.
- ⁹ Order for Korean Leaflet, General Headquarters (GHQ), Far East Command (FEC) Military Intelligence Section, General Staff, Psychological Warfare Branch, circa 1950. In Records of the Army Staff; Records of the Executive Office, Unclassified Decimal File 1949-1950, Entry 260A, Box 17, RG 319, NARA.
- ¹⁰ Monograph, "Civilian Control in South Korea," by LTC J.P. Powhida. In Records of the Office of the Provost Marshal General; Administrative Division Mail and Records Branch, Classified Decimal File 1951-1952, Entry 433B, Box 221, RG 389, NARA.
- ¹¹ War diary, 1st Cavalry Division, June-July 1950. In the Records of U. S. Army Commands, Cavalry Divisions 1940-1967, Box 131, RG 338, NARA.
- ¹² Ibid.
- ¹³ Ibid.
- ¹⁴ Ibid
- ¹⁵ Ibid and Activities report, Headquarters 1st Cavalry Division (Inf), July 1950. In the Records of the Adjutant General's Office, AG Command Reports 1949-1954, Box 4405, RG 407, NARA.

-
- ¹⁶ War Diary , 8th Cavalry Division, 18-30 July 1950. In the Records of U.S. Army Commands, Cavalry Regiments 1940-1967, Box 42, RG 338, NARA.
- ¹⁷ War diary summary, Headquarters 7th Cavalry (Infantry), June-July 1950. In the Records of the Adjutant General's Office, AG Command Reports 1949-1954, Box 4431, RG 407, NARA.
- ¹⁸ Ibid.
- ¹⁹ Ibid.
- ²⁰ Ibid.
- ²¹ Ibid.
- ²² Activities report, Headquarters 1st Cavalry Division (Inf), July 1950. In the Records of the Adjutant General's Office, AG Command Reports 1949-1954, Box 4405, RG 407, NARA.
- ²³ "Report of the First OCAFF (Office of the Chief of Army Field Forces) Observer Team to the Far East Command", 16 August 1950, RG 387, entry 55, Box 171, NARA.
- ²⁴ War diary summary, Headquarters 7th Cavalry (Infantry), June-July 1950. In the Records of the Adjutant General's Office, AG Command Reports 1949-1954, Box 4431, RG 407, NARA.
- ²⁵ Headquarters 1st Cavalry Division (Infantry), Periodic Intelligence Report #5, 1800 26 July 1950, Box 45, 1st Cavalry Division, Cavalry Divisions 1940-1967, RG 338, NARA.
- ²⁶ War diary, 1st Cavalry Division, June-July 1950. In the Records of U. S. Army Commands, Cavalry Divisions 1940-1967, Box 131, RG 338, NARA.
- ²⁷ War diary, 1st Cavalry Division, June-July 1950. In the Records of U. S. Army Commands, Cavalry Divisions 1940-1967, Box 131, RG 338, NARA.
- ²⁸ Interviews with three soldiers March 3, 2000.
- ²⁹ Memorandum, Headquarters (HQs) 1st Cavalry Division (1CD), 23 July 1950, sub: Control of Refugee Movement. In the Records of U.S. Army Commands, 1st Cavalry Division 1940-1967, Box 127, RG 338, NARA.
- ³⁰ Periodic Operations Report No. 13, 23 July 1950. In the Records of U.S. Army Commands, 1st Cavalry Division 1940-1967, Box 56, RG 338, NARA.
- ³¹ Korean witnesses are not identified by name but are identified by their status in July 1950, that is adult, teenager, or child. 4 children, 4 teenagers and 2 adults saw the radio.
- ³² Five Korean witness statements (3 teenagers, 1 child, and 1 adult).
- ³³ Korean witness statements (including 8 children, 4 teenagers, 2 adults and one person whose age was not provided).
- ³⁴ Korean witness statements (3 children, 2 teenagers and 3 adults).
- ³⁵ Korean witness statements (3 adults).
- ³⁶ Korean witness statements (1 child and 2 teenagers).

-
- ³⁷ Korean witness statement (child).
- ³⁸ Korean witness statement (child).
- ³⁹ Korean witness statement (child).
- ⁴⁰ See Chapter 3.
- ⁴¹ See Chapter 3.
- ⁴² HQ, 7th Cavalry (Infantry) War Diary, June-July 1950, in the records of the Adjutant General's Office, AG Command Reports 1949 - 1954, Box 4431, RG 407, NARA.
- ⁴³ See Appendix C.
- ⁴⁴ U.S. interviews with 4 officers, 2 noncommissioned officers, and 10 enlisted soldiers.
- ⁴⁵ U.S. interviews with 2 noncommissioned officers, 1 officer and 1 enlisted soldier.
- ⁴⁶ U.S. interviews with 4 pilots.
- ⁴⁷ U.S. interview with pilot.
- ⁴⁸ Based on the statements of Korean witnesses, the refugees who were fired on did not arrive in this area until after or about the same time the 5th Cavalry Regiment was departing.
- ⁴⁹ While these terrain features are located in the No Gun Ri area, similar terrain features in Korea may contribute to confusion in the veteran's memories.
- ⁵⁰ One of the soldiers who believed there must have been an order to fire mortar rounds conceded that he believed the mortar round he saw fall was a warning round. Several veterans including 3 noncommissioned officers and 2 enlisted soldiers believe there must have been an order.
- ⁵¹ Memorandum, Commander, 25th Infantry Division, 27 Jul 50.
- ⁵² Ibid.
- ⁵³ U.S. interview with pilot.
- ⁵⁴ U.S. interview with pilot.
- ⁵⁵ U.S. interview with pilot.
- ⁵⁶ U.S. interview with pilot.
- ⁵⁷ U.S. interview with officer.
- ⁵⁸ Valley Forge (CV 45), *Report of Operations*, 16 July to 31 July 1950, 16.
<<http://www.history.navy.mil/branches/v-forge.htm>>
- ⁵⁹ See Chapter 3.
- ⁶⁰ See Chapter 1.

⁶¹ Korean witness statements (1 child and 1 teenager).

⁶² Korean witness statement (adult).

⁶³ Korean witness statement summarized in ROK, "On-Site Technical Investigation." provided to the U.S. Review Team in August 2000.

⁶⁴ Different Korean witnesses give different estimates including the following: 60 dead bodies in the tunnel; 60 to 100 people died in the tunnels; the bombing killed about 100 -150 people and there were 50 -60 bodies were on the railroad track.

⁶⁵ Korean witness statements summarized in ROK "On-Site Technical Investigation" provided to U.S. Review Team in August 2000.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Korean witness statement summarized in ROK "On-Site Technical Investigation."

⁶⁹ Korean witness statements (3 children and 1 teenager) and witness statements summarized in ROK "On-site Technical Investigation."

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ See note 5.

⁷² U.S. Veteran estimates of wounded and dead varied for example 8 - 9 who could have been dead or injured, possibly several dead or injured, close to two hundred, and maybe 50 -60 killed or injured I am just not sure. At least ten veterans talk about refugees being killed or injured in the vicinity of No Gun Ri. However, some of the veterans who observed dead or injured refugees and do not know how or when they were wounded.

⁷³ Appendix B, Tab 1.

⁷⁴ Appendix D and Appendix B, Tab 2.